

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-24, and 50-72 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 25-49 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 8 have been amended here. Claims 50-72 have been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Paragraph 1, line 1 of the specification was objected to for failure to include the serial number (10/684,952) of a related application. This informality has now been corrected.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis. The claim has been amended such that the rejection is now moot.

Claims 14-17 were objected to but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. New claim 50 includes all of the limitations of claims 1, 9, 10, 13, and 14 and is now believed allowable as indicated by the Examiner.

Claims 15 and 16 originally depended directly or indirectly from claim 14, but now depend from new claim 50 and are also believed allowable.

Likewise, new claim 69 includes all of the limitations of claims 1, 9, 10, 13, and 17 and is also believed allowable as indicated by the Examiner.

In addition, new dependent claims 51-68 and 70-72 depend directly or indirectly from either new independent claim 50 or independent claim 69 and are also allowable for depending from a claim deemed allowable as well as for their own limitations.

Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 10, 13, 18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bekiaris, *et al.* However, independent claim 1 has now been amended such that it now defines over the Bekiaris, *et al.* reference. More specifically,

claim 1 now requires that the process for etching the first dielectric material be selective to the second dielectric material, and that the process for etching the second dielectric material be selective to the first dielectric material. Amended claim 1 also requires that the CTE of the first dielectric be substantially similar to the CTE of the conductive material. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 now patentably defines over the Bekiaris, *et al.* reference. Of course, dependent claims 10-13, 18, and 21 are also allowable for depending from a claim deemed allowable as well as for their own limitations. Likewise, claims 3-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, and 22-24 depend from claim 1 and are now also believed allowable.

Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kihara, *et al.* However, independent claim 1 has been amended as discussed above such that it now clearly defines over Kihara, *et al.* and is now believed to be allowable.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone James C. Kesterson, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan 3, 2006
Date

James C. Kesterson
James C. Kesterson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 25,882

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252-5793
Tel. 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218